

### United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Vignia 22313-1450 www.nspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/768,732	01/24/2001	Wayne W. Wang	13160US02	1228
75	90 08/13/2003			
Christopher C. Winslade McAndrews Held & Malloy 500 W. Madison Street			EXAMINER	
			NGUYEN, CAO H	
Suite 3400 Chicago, IL 60661		•	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2173	
			DATE MAILED: 08/13/2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

J

M

# Office Action Summary

Application No. 09/768,732

Applicant(s)

Wang et al.

Examiner

Cao (Kevin) Nguyen

Art Unit 2173



	The MAILING DATE of this communication appears	on the cover sh	neet with	the correspondence address		
	for Reply					
THE	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.					
- Extens mailing	- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.					
- If the p - If NO p - Failure - Any re	period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply a to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the ply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the platent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	and will expire SIX (6) he application to beco	) MONTHS f	from the mailing date of this communication.		
Status						
1) 💢	Responsive to communication(s) filed on Jan 24, 2	2001		·		
2a) ☐ This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☑ This action is non-final.						
	Since this application is in condition for allowance e closed in accordance with the practice under Ex pair	except for form arte Quayle, 19	nal matte 335 C.D.	ers, prosecution as to the merits is . 11; 453 O.G. 213.		
	tion of Claims			:		
4) 🗶	Claim(s) <u>1-26</u>	<del></del>		is/are pending in the application.		
4	la) Of the above, claim(s)					
5) 🗆	Claim(s)			is/are allowed.		
6) 💢	Claim(s) <u>1-26</u>			is/are rejected.		
	Claim(s)					
8) 🗆	Claims	are	subject	t to restriction and/or election requirement.		
Applica	tion Papers					
9) 🗆	The specification is objected to by the Examiner.			l		
10)💢	The drawing(s) filed on Jan 24, 2001 is/are	a) 💢 accepte	ed or b)	$\square$ objected to by the Examiner.		
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the d	Irawing(s) be he	ıld in abe	yance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).		
11)	The proposed drawing correction filed on	is	: a)□	approved b) $\square$ disapproved by the Examiner.		
_	If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.					
12)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Exami	ner.				
	under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120					
	Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign pr	riority under 35	5 U.S.C.	§ 119(a)-(d) or (f).		
a)	☐ All b)☐ Some* c)☐ None of:					
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.					
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No					
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority do application from the International Burea	au (PCT Rule 1	l 7.2(a}).			
_	ee the attached detailed Office action for a list of the					
	Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic					
Ċ	a) U The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.					
	Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic	priority under	35 U.S.(	C. §§ 120 and/or 121.		
Attachme		m				
	tice of References Cited (PTO-892) tice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s).  5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)				
	omation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	5) Notice of Infe	ormal Patent	t Application (PTO-152)		
	The second of th	of other:				

Page 2

Application/Control Number: 09/768,732

Art Unit: 2173

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35-USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103© and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

2. Claims 1-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jamtgaard et al. (US Patent No. 6,430,624 B1) in view of Sugiarto et al. (US Patent No. 6,278,449).

Regarding claim 1, Sugiarto discloses an apparatus for the generation and application of a set of rules to transform source content into result content for a content receiving device, the apparatus comprising a source content area for retrieving the source content (see col.3, lines 24-57); an analyzer for identifying separate elements within the source content and assigning an identifier to each element; a result content area providing selective placement of the elements according to a desired layout (see col. 4, lines 11-59); and an application device for applying the transformation rules to the source content that is requested by the content receiving device (see col. 6, lines 11-65). However, Sugiarto fails to explicitly teach a rule generator for generating a set of transformation rules for transforming the source content into the result content according to their selective placement.

Jamtgaard teaches a rule generator for generating a set of transformation rules for transforming the source content into the result content according to their selective placement (see col. 4, lines 34-67 and col. 5, lines 27-67). It would have been obvious to one of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a rule generator for generating a set of transformation rules for transforming the source content into the result content according to their selective placement as taught by Jamtgaard to the webpage source content of Sugiarto; in order to delivery other types of Webpage content to devices having different input/ouput and to enhance a user friendly.

Regarding claim 2, Sugiarto discloses wherein the source content area and result content area are part of a graphical editing tool (see col. 7, lines 48-67).

Regarding claim 3, Sugiarto discloses wherein editing tools provide for graphical placement of source content from the source content area into the result content area as result content (see col. 4; lines 12-54).

Regarding claim 4, Jamtgaard discloses wherein a storage device is used to store the transformation rules for access by the application device. (see col. 5, lines 27-67)

Regarding claims 5 and 6, Jamtgaard discloses wherein the server device is a proxy server device that receives a request for source content, retrieves the source content from a corresponding web server device, and transforms the source content to result content according to the transformation rules (see col. 7, lines-13-67 and col. 8, lines 1-54).

Regarding claims 7 and 8, Jamtgaard discloses wherein the graphical editing tool is running on a design station device; and wherein the design station device is in communication with the application device in order to provide the transformation rules (see col.13, lines 19-50).

Regarding claim 9, Surgiato discloses wherein the source content and result content includes web page information, and the content receiving device is a web enabled device (see col. 20, lines 20-67).

Claim 10 differs from claim 1 in that "a web page editor running on the at least one design station, whereby a source web page is retrieved and the layout of a result web page is

formed according to the different device capabilities; and a rule generator associated with the web page editor for generating a set of transform rules to convert the source page to the result page, the transform rules being communicated to the at least one proxy server device, wherein the web enabled devices request information from the at least one web site through the at least one proxy server which applies the transform rules to the requested information" which read on Jamtgaard (see col. 14, lines 4-67 and figures (213)).

As claims 11-13 are analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claims 5-10 above.

Claim 14 differs from claims—I and—I 0 in-that—a-first-display area for displaying the source content; a second display area for displaying the result content, a set of graphical tools whereby the source content can be graphically moved with the tools from the first area to the second area to form a result layout which read on Jamtgaard (see col. 17, lines 22-67 and col. 18, lines 1-40).

As claims 15-18 are analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claims 5-10 and 14 above.

Regarding claims 19-21, Jamtgaard discloses wherein the communication includes a network link; and wherein the network link includes the Internet; and wherein the communication includes a wireless link (see figures 2-5).

Claim 22 differs from claims 1, 10 and 14 in that "arranging result information content from the source information content according to the capabilities of the receiving device;

generating transformation rules according to the transformation between the source information content and the result information content; and applying the appropriate transformation rules to the source information content when the content is requested by the receiving device." which read on Jamtgaard (see figures 4-6).

As claims 23-26 are analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claims 5-10, 14 and 22 above.

### Conclusion

3. The prior art made of record-and-not-relied-upon-is-considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. (PTO-892).

Response

4. Responses to this action should be mailed to: Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Washington, D.C. 20231. If applicant desires to fax a response, (703) 308-6306 may be used for formal communications.

Please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT" for informal facsimile communications. For after final responses, please label "AFTER FINAL" or "EXPEDITED PROCEDURE" on the document.

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA. Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

### Inquires

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cao (Kevin) Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 305-3972. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:30 am to 6:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John W. Cabeca, can be reached on (703) 308-3116. The fax number for this group is (703) 746-7240.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

CAO (KEVIN) NOUVEN PRIMARY EXAMINER

August 06, 2003

STATES OF